

Studies on Byzantium, Seljuks, and Ottomans

Reprinted Studies

by Speros Vryonis, jr.

Library of Congress Card Number: 81-51168

ISBN: 0-89003-071-5 (paper); 0-89003-072-3 (cloth)

UNDENA PUBLICATIONS
Malibu 1981

ISLAMIC SOURCES FOR THE HISTORY OF THE GREEK PEOPLE

SPEROS VRYONIS, JR.

The least investigated body of source materials dealing with the history of the Greek-speaking people prior to modern times is undoubtedly that body of historical sources which we might call Islamic. This is doubly lamentable. First, the rise of Islam and the whole course of Islamic history down to the present day have had a profound impact on the history of the Greeks. The progress of Islamic civilization led initially to the circumscription of Greek civilization in Egypt, Syria, and Palestine, then in Asia Minor, and finally it resulted in the destruction of the Byzantine Empire and the Islamization of the medieval capital of Hellenism, Constantinople. Thereafter an Islamic state ruled most Greek-speakers until the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. The conflict of Islamic and Hellenic traditions was most recently, and most disastrously for the Greeks, manifested in Cyprus. Second, the very body of written materials emanating from the Islamic world and which deal with the historical experience of the Greeks is vast, variegated, and very significant.

The explanation for the neglect of these important sources lies in the realm of the historical development of scholarship in Greece, and in the West at large. Up until recently, and indeed even now, there are to be found within Greece substantial numbers of Greeks who as a result of their origins in Turkey or in one of the Arab countries, have an excellent knowledge either of Turkish or of one of the Arab dialects. Thus there is a ready-made reservoir of potential Turkologists or Arabists who might deal with portions of this vast body of Islamic written materials that illumine the history of the Greeks. By and large this ready-made reservoir has not been satisfactorily exploited, though to be sure there are certain exceptions. This is accompanied by the astounding fact that there are no regular university chairs in the languages, history, and culture of the Islamic world to be found in Greece. All this is an outgrowth of the narrow nationalist framework within which the Greek universities and educational systems have evolved.

The condition in Western scholarly milieus is quite different in that there are centuries-old traditions in the study of Greek culture and indeed of the culture of the Middle East. The difficulty in the exploitation of the Islamic source materials for the history of the Greeks in the West is that the disciplines of Islamic, Byzantine, and Ottoman history are too often compartmentalized in such a fashion that the scholar trained in one field is not trained to deal with the other field, and in any case there prevails a spirit of

narrow parochial, disciplinary loyalties. Despite this there are certain notable exceptions in regard to the relations of Byzantine and Islamic civilizations which include the late Alexander Vasiliev, the Russian Byzantinist who set out to collect and to translate the Arabic sources dealing with the history of Byzantium,¹ and the French Arabo-Byzantinist Marius Canard, author of a series of books and articles which had as their epicenter the relations of Byzantium and Islam.² He not only continued the work of Vasiliev in the translation of Arabic sources, but he edited and collated the various Arab texts which illumined the life and deeds of the tenth-century Arab emir, Sayf al-Daula, Byzantium's primary foe during the religious wars of the tenth century. This culminated in the monumental study of the Hamdanid dynasty, which in slightly less than nine hundred pages chronicled the Arabo-Byzantine epic. Most recently, A. Miguel, in the second volume of his history of Arab geography, has given us a comparative and exhaustive treatment of the Arab geographers and their data and information concerning Byzantium.³

The body of Islamic literature which informs us as to the history of the Greeks breaks down into two basic linguistic and chronological groups. First, there is the corpus of writings in Arabic, which deals with the Greeks down into the fourteenth century. This literature is of a highly diverse nature, including as it does chronicles, poetry, religious polemic, and political treaties. With the notable exception of the papyri and certain other isolated documents, this Arabic material is non-archival, that is to say, it does not emanate from governmental and administrative bureaus. The second body of literature, extraordinarily vast and very little investigated, is in the Turkish language and has emanated from the administrative apparatus of the Ottoman empire. A small number of Greek scholars has begun to investigate this material in the post-World War II era. Among them are P. Hidiroglu, E. Zachariadou-Oikonomidou, V. Demetriades, and D. Gutas.

I propose to look very cursorily at samplings of these two bodies of materials in order to illustrate the extent, richness, and importance of these bodies of materials.

As for the Arabic sources they provide two basic categories of information that are of concern to us here. First, they give us whatever information we have about the fate of Byzantine civilization in those former Byzantine provinces of the Levant which fell to the Arab conquerors in the seventh century. Second, the Arab authors record significant data about the Byzantine empire itself, for example, its system of provincial administration, the military apparatus, trade, the city of Constantinople, political and military relations with the Arabs, and internal events within the empire itself.⁴

In the former category of particular interest is the political fate of the Hellenized regions of the Levant in the seventh century, and here the most important source is al-Baladhuri's *Futuh al-Buldan* (Conquests of the

Lands), a composition of the second half of the ninth century. He gives the varying accounts of the conquest of Damascus by the Arabs, of the battle of the Yarmuk River which decided the fate of Byzantine control in the Levant, and of the substitution of the Arabic language for Greek and Persian in the financial administration of the new Arab empire. In chapter eight he gives one version of the siege and conquest of the important Byzantine city of Damascus.

When the Moslems were done with the fight against those who were gathered at al-Marj, they stayed there for fifteen days at the end of which they returned [sic] to Damascus. This took place fourteen days before the end of Muharram, year 14. . . . The inhabitants of Damascus betook themselves to the fortifications and closed the gate of the city. Khalid ibn al-Walid at the head of some 5,000 men whom abu-'Ubaid had put under his command, camped at al-Bab ash-Sharki (the east gate). Some assert that Khalid was the chief commander but was dismissed when Damascus was under siege. The convent by which Khalid camped was called Dair Khalid. Amir ibn al-Asi camped at the Tuma gate, Shurahbil at the Paradis gate, abu-'Ubaidah at the Jabiyah gate, and Yazid bin abi-Sufyan from the Saghir gate to the one known as Kaisan gate. Abu-ad-Darda' appointed 'Uwaimir ibn-'Amir al-Khazraji commander of a frontier garrison settled in the fortification at Barzah.

The statement written by Khalid. The bishop who had provided Khalid with food at the beginning of the siege was wont to stand on the wall. Once Khalid called him, and when he came, Khalid greeted him and talked with him. The bishop said to him, "Abu-Salaiman, thy case is prospering and thou hast made a promise to fulfill for me; let us make terms for this city." Thereupon, Khalid called for an inkhorn and parchment and wrote:

"In the name of Allah, the compassionate the merciful. This is what Khalid would grant to the inhabitants of Damascus, if he enters therein: he promises to give them security for their lives, property and churches. Their city-wall shall not be demolished; neither shall any Moslem be quartered in their houses. Thereunto we give to them the pact of Allah and the protection of his Prophet, the caliphs, and the 'Believers'. So long as they pay the poll-tax, nothing but good shall befall them."

The Moslems enter the city. One night, a friend of the bishop came to Khalid and informed him of the fact that it was the night of a feast for the inhabitants of the city, that they were all busy and that they had blocked the Sharki gates with stones and left it unguarded. He then suggested that Khalid should procure a ladder. Certain occupants of the convent, by which Khalid's army camped, brought him two ladders on which some Moslems climbed to the highest part of the wall, and descended to the gate which was guarded only by one or two men. The Moslems cooperated and opened the door. This took place at sunrise.

In the meantime, abu-'Ubaidah had managed to open the Jabiyah gate and sent certain Moslems over its wall. This made the Greek fighters pour to his side and lead a violent fight against the Moslems. At last the Moslems opened the Jabiyah gate by force and made thier entrance through it. Abu-'Ubaidah and Khalid ibn-al-Walid met al-Maksalat which was the quarter of the coppersmiths in Damascus. . . .³

The battle which decided the political, and therefore civilizational, fate of Syria was fought at the Yarmuk river, and here again al-Baladhuri is a principal source.

Heraclius gathered large bodies of Greeks, Syrians, Mesopotamians and Armenians numbering about 200,000. This army he put under the command of one of his choice men and sent as a vanguard Jabalah ibn-al-Aiham al-Ghassani at the head of the "neutralized" Arabs of Syria of the tribes of Lakhm, Judham and others, resolving to fight the Moslems so that he might either win or withdraw to the land of the Greeks and live in Constantinople. The Moslems gathered together and the Greek army marched against them. The battle they fought at al-Yarmuk was of the fiercest and bloodiest kind. Al-Yarmuk is a river. In this battle 24,000 Moslems took part. The Greeks and their followers in this battle tied themselves to each other by chains, so that no one might set his hope on flight. By Allah's help, some 70,000 of them were put to death, and their remnants took to flight, reaching as far as Palestine, Antioch, Aleppo, Mesopotamia and Armenia. In the battle of al-Yarmuk certain Moslem women took part and fought violently. Among them was Hind, daughter of 'Utbah and mother of Mu'waiyah bun-abi-Sufyan, who repeatedly exclaimed, "Cut the arms of these 'uncircumcized' with your swords!" Her husband abu-Sufyan had come to Syria as a volunteer desiring to see his sons, and so he brought his wife with him. . . . When Heraclius received the news about the troops in al-Yarmuk and the destruction of his army by the Moslems, he fled from Antioch to Constantinople, and as he passed ad-Darb he turned and said, "Peace unto thee, o Syria, and what an excellent country this is for the enemy!"—referring to the numerous pastures in Syria.⁶

It is al-Baladhuri who informs us on the persistence of the Greek language in Arab fiscal administration in Syria during the first Islamic century and then on its replacement by Arabic. This is obviously an important point in any consideration of the fate of Greek influence and elements in the new Islamic empire.

Greek remained the language of the stage registers until the reign of 'Abd-al-Malik ibn-Marwan, who in the year 81 ordered it changed. The reason was that a Greek clerk desiring to write something and finding no ink urined in the inkstand. Hearing this, 'Abd-al-Malik punished the man and gave orders to Sulaiman ibn-Sa'd to change the language of the registers. Sulaiman requested 'Abd al-Malik to give him as subsidy the kharadj of the Jordan province for one year. 'Abd-al-Malik granted this request and assigned him to the governorship of the Jordan. No sooner had the year ended, than the change of the language was finished and Sulaiman brought the registers to 'Abd-al-Malik. The latter called Sarjun (Sergius) and presented to him the new plan. Sarjun was greatly chagrined and left 'Abd-al-Malik sorrowful. Meeting certain Greek clerks, he said to them, "Seek your livelihood in any other profession than this, for God has cut it off from you."

Writing five hundred years later Ibn Khaldun confirms this persistence of the Byzantine administrative tradition and then its alteration.

No specific ranks existed among the yearly Muslims in the fields of tax collection, expenditures, and bookkeeping. The Moslems were illiterate Arabs who did not know how to write and keep books. For bookkeeping they employed Jews, Christians, or certain non-Arab clients versed in it. Bookkeeping was little known among them. Their nobles did not know it well, because illiteracy was their distinctive characteristic.⁸

More interesting perhaps is the fate of the Greek intellectual heritage in the lands of the caliphate, a subject on which the Greek sources are relatively silent but on which the Arab texts are particularly eloquent. In this respect and aside from the texts of the actual translations from Greek into Arabic, the most important source is the *Fihrist* of the tenth-century author al-Nadim. He attributes the first efforts of translation of the Greek texts to the caliph Khalid ibn Yazid ibn Muawiyah.

Khalid ibn Yazid ibn Mu'awiyah was called the "Wise Man of the Family of Marwan." He was inherently virtuous, with an interest in and fondness for the sciences. As the Art (alchemy) attracted his attention, he ordered a group of Greek philosophers who were living in a city of Egypt to come to him. Because he was concerned with literary Arabic, he commanded them to translate the books about the Art from the Greek and Coptic languages into Arabic. This was the first translation in Islam from one language into another.⁹

In describing the reasons for the increase of literature on classical Greek subjects al-Nadim gives the following account.

Mention of the Reason why Books on Philosophy and Other Ancient Sciences Became Plentiful in this Country.

One of the reasons for this was that al-Ma'mun saw in a dream the likeness of a man white in color, with ruddy complexion, broad forehead, joined eyebrows, bald head, bloodshot eyes, and good qualities sitting on his bed. Al-Ma'mun related, "It was as though I was in front of him, filled with fear of him. Then I said, 'Who are you?' He replied, 'I am Aristotle.' Then I was delighted with him and said, 'Oh sage, may I ask you a question?' He said, 'Ask it.' Then I asked, 'What is good?' He replied, 'What is good in the mind.' I said again, 'Then what is next?' He answered, 'What is good in the law.' I said, 'Then what next?' He replied, 'What is good with the public.' I said, 'Then what more?' He answered, 'More? There is no more.'"¹⁰

This dream was one of the most definite reasons for the output of books. Between al-Ma'mun and the Byzantine emperor there was correspondence, for al-Ma'mun sought aid opposing him. Then he wrote to the Byzantine emperor asking his permission to obtain a selection of old scientific (manuscripts), stored and treasured in the Byzantine country. After first refusing, he complied with this. Accordingly, al-Ma'mun sent forth a group of men, among whom were al-Hajjaj ibn Matar; ibn al-Batriq; Salman, the director of the Bayt al-Hikmah; and others besides them. They brought the books selected from what they had found. Upon bringing them to him (al-Ma'mun), he ordered them to translate (the manuscripts) so that they made the translation.¹¹

Thus commenced the fateful era of the translation of the Greek texts, usually via Syriac, into Arabic, a process which was to have a great significance for the evolution of Islamic civilization. Al-Nadim then gives a detailed catalogue of the translators and lists of the Greek texts which they translated. Illustrative is the paragraph on Hunayn.

Hunayn ibn Ishaq al-'Ibadi was surnamed Abu Zayd. The 'Ibad were Christians of al-Hirah. He excelled in the profession of medicine and was a master of literary style in the Greek, Syriac and Arabic languages. He traveled through the land to collect ancient books, even going into the Byzantine coun-

try. Most of his translation was for the Banu Musa. He died on Tuesday, the sixth day of Safar (the second Muslim month), during the year two hundred and sixty (AD 873/74), which was the first day of Kanun al-Awwal (December) in the year one thousand one hundred and eighty-five of Alexander the Greek.¹²

He translated works from Plato, Aristotle, and the physicians, and also wrote numerous commentaries. Of particular interest were his treatments of medical subjects according to the Greek texts. In short, al-Nadim's *Fihrist* is our most detailed and best medieval source on the diffusion of the Greek classics in the Islamic world, a subject scarcely mentioned in the Greek texts of the Byzantine era.

Al-Baladhuri and al-Nadim are among the most important Islamic sources that tell us of the fate of the Greeks and their culture in the Middle East during the period. But the Arab texts of the second category tell us much as well about the history of the Greek speakers in Byzantium proper. They are particularly important for the great administrative changes of the middle Byzantine period which centered about the so-called system of the themes. Here the principal texts are those of the geographers Ibn Khurdadbeh, Ibn al-Faqih, and Qudama, and of the historian Masudi. These texts, perhaps ultimately going back to a common source (Muslim al-Djarmi) give a detailed delineation of the great administrative divisions known as themes, their officials, their military manpower, and the governmental salaries paid out to the military-administrative personnel. Very often these details are lacking in the Byzantine sources.¹³ Of similar interest to Arab travellers, geographers, ambassadors, and prisoners of war was the imperial city of Constantinople itself, so that many details concerning its monuments, topography, and court life have been recorded in their writings.¹⁴ A central event, and indeed a new turning point in the political and military relations of the Muslims and Byzantines, occurred at the fateful battle of Manzikert in the year 1071. Muslim chroniclers turned their attention to this battle and we have several Arab accounts of it. Of these it will suffice to translate but one, whose author remains unknown. Though it does not have the detailed nature of the Greek account of Attaliates, it gives us the Muslim side, which is lacking in Attaliates.

The sultan approached the emperor of the Rum in a place called Zuhurat (flower) between Khleat and Malazgird on Wednesday on the fifteenth of Dhu-l-Qada in the year 463, and the sultan sent to him in regard to a truce. He (emperor) answered that the truce should be in Ray, and the sultan was alarmed at that. His imam and jurisprudent Abu Nasir Muhammad ibn 'Abdu-l Malik al-Buhari al-Hanafi remarked: "You are fighting for the religion of God and I hope that God, may He be exalted, has inscribed your name on this victory. Meet them on Friday at the hour during which the khatibs (preachers) are in the minbars praying on behalf of the warriors of the faith (and) for victory over the infidels and the prayer will be recited accompanied by responses." On Friday the sultan waited until the prayer of the khatibs and recited His word, May He be exalted: "There is no victory save from God," and the sultan said: "Perhaps

there is among the khatibs one who says at the end of his prayer, 'O God, grant victory to the enemies of the Muslims and to their military detachments. . . .'" Nizam al-Mulk returned to Hamadan to preserve Iraq, Khorasan, Mazanderan from the people of blame and depravity, and the sultan threw himself into peril and he said: "Who wishes departure, let him depart for here there is no sultan who gives orders, who commands and who prohibits, for (this is) forbidden for other than God." He cast down his bow and arrows and he took the sword and tied the tail of his horse on his hand, and all his army began to do what he had done. When the armies met the Rum dug trenches around the army and the sultan said: "They are defeated, by God, because they dig trenches with the greatness of their number, for (it is) an indication of cowardice and faint-heartedness." The Qaysar of the Rum struck his pavillion of red satin and a tent like it and a tent of silk brocade, sat on a throne of gold and above it (was) a cross of gold inlaid with jewels which were beyond value. In his presence there were many men, monks and priests, reading aloud the Gospel. The two armies met on Friday, while a khatib of the Muslims ascended the minbar and the voices rose in recitation and the voices of the drums of the sultan's army, and the sounds of the gongs of the Christian army. There was set in motion a whirlwind which blinded the Muslims. As the sultan's army was about to be defeated the sultan descended from his horse and prayed to God, may He be exalted, and said: "O God! I rely upon You and I seek Your favor in this holy war and I soiled my face in your presence and I smear it with the essence of my heart and eyes moistened from weeping and the two sides of my neck with blood. And if you know of my innermost mind anything contrary from that which I have said with my tongue (then) destroy me and whomsoever is with me of my assistants and my gulams. And if the heart conforms to my exterior then assist me in the holy war against the enemies and place before me, from your part, victorious dominion. Transform for me the difficult into the simple." And he repeated this supplication and weeping until the motion of the wind changed and blew into the eyes of the infidels and the determination of God uprooted the tree of outrage and cut off the pride of error. And he studied the banners of the Nazarenes, and one saw the people inebriated but they were not inebriated. When the sun became yellow the dust of the battlefield cleared and there embraced the emperor of the Rum the hand of captivity and disaster and the manner was thus. A horse belonging to some one of the gulams of the sultan strayed, and this gulam followed the track of his horse and found a horse with an ornamented bridle and a saddle of gold, and a man seated by the horse with a helmet of gold in his presence and armor inlaid with gold. The gulam started to slay him but the man said to him: "I am Caesar of the Rum, do not kill me for the slaying of kings is an ill omen." The gulam stayed his hand and led him to the sultan's camp and no one of the prisoners of the Rum saw him save that he touched his forehead to the earth. The messenger reached the sultan's presence and he prayed the evening prayer. They made him (emperor) enter (in the presence of) the sultan and the chamberlain seized him by the hair and chest and threw him down to the ground so that he should kiss it, but he did not kiss it in the presence of the sultan, because he was carried away by the pride of kingship and its splendour. And the sultan said: "Leave him alone. . . ."

Saad ud-Dawlat Gawharain had a mamaluke. He had given him as a gift to the vizir Nizam al-Mulk, but the latter returned him and did not pay attention to him for he saw him as small. Gawharain desired it very much (i.e., that Nizam al-Mulk should keep him), so the vizir Nizam al-Mulk said: "What do you desire of him, that he might bring us as captive the emperor and Qaysar of the Rum?" And it turned out just as the vizir Nizam al-Mulk said. On the day

of the battle the gulam brought the emperor of the Rum prisoner in the presence of the sultan, and the sultan ordered his (emperor's) shackling. The sultan had the gulam make a wish, he wished for the governorship of Gazna, and he granted him that.

I heard from Khwga Imam Mushrif al-Shirazi the merchant on the bank of the Gaihun opposite Dargan, as we were descending to Khwarezm, and he said: "I heard from many shaykhs that when the army of the sultan Alp Arslan and the armies of the Rum were locked in battle, the emperor of the Rum sent a messenger to the sultan and informed him: 'I am coming against you and with me are armies against which you have no power. If you enter into obedience to me I shall leave to you of your land that which will suffice for you and you will be safe from my attack and my power. But if you do not do this, there are with me armies of 300,000 cavalry and infantry, and with me (are) 14,000 wagons and in them stores of wealth and arms and it is not (possible) for any of the armies of the Muslims to halt in my presence; and no city of their cities and no fortress of their fortresses can resist me.' When the sultan heard this messenger the glorious power of Islam seized him and the pride of sovereignty stirred in his breast and he said to the emissary: 'Tell your master that it is not you who intended to come but God, praise be to Him, who brought you to me, and will render you and your armies food for the Muslims, and you will be my prisoners and slaves. Of your armies some will be slain and some captured, and all your treasures will be my property and my wealth. Stand firm in the struggle and prepare for the battle and you will see that your armies will be like driven herds and your treasures will be delivered to their spoilers.' On the early morning of the next day the war took place between them and there occurred everything which the sultan had said, by the assistance of God and by the success which He granted. When the emperor of the Rum was brought before the couch of the sultan the emperor of the Rum said to the interpreter: 'Tell the sultan to return me to the capital of my kingdom before the Rum agree on another emperor and he openly declares battle and war. . . . Let the book of hostility be wiped out and let the page of rebellion emerge and I shall be more obedient to you than your slaves and each year I shall deposit with you, by way of gizya, 1,000,000 dinars.' The sultan accepted his request after the slave traders displayed him in the place of sale in the bazaar. Then the sultan manumitted him, and placed a robe on him and gave him a gift and to those who had remained in captivity with him. The emperor departed for his capital of his kingdom and carried out that which he promised. There arrived to the sultan Alp Arslan a letter of congratulations on the conquest and victory from al-Qaim bi'amri'llahi the emir of the faithful, addressing him in it: 'Son, most exalted lord the confirmed, the victorious, the conqueror, most powerful sultan, ruler of Arabs and Persians, lord of the rulers of the world, brightness of the religion, succour of the Muslims, assistant of the imams, refuge of mankind, support of the victorious kingdom, the conqueror, the crown of gleaming religion, sultan of the domains of Muslims, proof of the emir of the faithful, may God watch over him and increase his good fortune.'"¹⁵

The consequence of the battle of Manzikert was the settlement of Turkish tribesmen in Asia Minor, the gradual processes of Islamization and Turkification of large segments of the Greek and Armenian populations. The fate of this Christian and Greek-speaking population is in part reflected in another Islamic text, this time in Persian, the *Menakib al-Arifin* of the Mevlevi dervish Eflaki, written in the first half of the fourteenth century. By

II

this time the process of the Islamization of the Greeks of Asia Minor had taken on serious dimensions. This disappearance of the Greek speakers is of especial significance as Asia Minor had constituted the heartland of Byzantium and its civilization from the seventh through the eleventh century. The Menakib al-Arifin describes individual and large-scale conversions from all classes of Greek society: youths, a painter, an architect. At the funeral of Djalal al-Din Rumi, as well as at that of his grandson Amir Arif, many Christians are said to have converted to Islam. The text also describes stages of religious syncretism between Greek Christianity and sufi Islam, a process which tended toward the conversion of the Greeks. These texts have been commented on in great detail elsewhere.¹⁶

All of these texts, from al-Baladhuri through Eflaki, have essentially a narrative character. Reconstruction of the history of the Greeks on the basis of such texts must in a sense be impressionistic. In contrast, the body of Ottoman texts that will concern us here is of an archival nature, very specific in content and composed to describe *ad hoc* situations for the purposes of fiscality and governance. Perhaps the most fundamental documents are those which constitute the tahrir defters, or detailed demographic surveys of the Ottoman provinces which record the numbers of taxable hearths in each province and list the hearths according to sectarian affiliation, Muslim, Christian, or Jewish. Professor Barkan has extrapolated the relevant demographic statistics for the taxable hearths in Greek-speaking lands in the early sixteenth century and it is of great interest to look at them briefly.¹⁷

Provinces (hearthths)	Muslim	Christian	Jewish	Total
Pasha	66,684	183,512	2,998	253,194
Tchirmen	12,686	1,578		14,264
Vize	12,193	9,467		21,660
Gallipoli (Imbros, Thasos, Limnos)	5,001	3,901	23	8,925
Rhodes and Cos	1,121	5,191		6,312
Mytilene	332	7,327		7,629
Jannina	613	32,097		32,710
Karli-ili	7	11,395		11,402
Trikala	12,347	57,671	387	70,405
Euboia	663	33,065		33,728
Morea	1,065	49,412	464	50,941
Totals	112,712	394,616	3,872	

There are two different totals: (a) 511,200 in adding laterally, (b) 511,170 in adding vertically. Also there is a discrepancy in the total number of Jews, for seemingly Thessaloniki is not added in here.

<i>Cities (hearths)</i>	<i>Muslim</i>	<i>Christian</i>	<i>Jewish</i>	<i>Total</i>
Adrianople	3,338	522	201	4,061
Athens	11	2,286		2,297
Saloniki	1,229	989	2,645	4,863
Serres	671	357	65	1,093
Trikala	301	343	181	825
Larissa	693	75		768
	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>
Totals	6,243	4,572	3,092	13,907
Istanbul	9,517	5,162	1,647	16,326

These hearth figures not only enable us to estimate the population numbers and the proportions of Greeks to Turks, but they indicate those areas in Greek lands where the initial demographic impact of the Turks was greatest. By comparing the hearth census of a given region over an extended period of time one can trace either the progress of Islamization of the Greeks or else their persistence in the Orthodox faith. An excellent study recently completed by Professor Lowry has traced this process in the city and district of Trebizond, originally Greek, in the defters of 1486, 1523, 1553, and 1583.¹⁸

	Muslim Hearths		Christian Hearths	
c. 1486	1,290	(19.22%)	5,421	(80.78%)
c. 1523	1,005	(14.32%)	6,012	(85.78%)
1553	2,850	(46.72%)	3,250	(53.28%)
1583	5,670	(53.12%)	4,905	(46.38%)

The Turkish scholar Miroglu has recently analyzed the defters for the years 1516, 1520, and 1530, concerning the district of Bayburd, adjacent to Trebizond, where the Armenian element must have predominated over the Greeks, with the following results.¹⁹

	Muslim Hearths	Christian Hearths
1516	5,585	16,391
1520	32,277	30,665
1530	19,866	22,928

The Ottoman archives tell us a great deal concerning the fate of the old Byzantine provincial aristocracy. Two defters of the fifteenth century indicate that a number of old Byzantine landed magnates were absorbed into the Ottoman system of military fiefs as spahis in Thessaly:

1454-1455 Of 182 timars, 36 belonged to Christian spahis.

1466-1467 Of 343 timars, only 20 were Christian, and 19 belonged to Muslim converts.²⁰

In the sanjak of Bayburt the defters give the following data.

1516 Of 191 timars, 63 belonged to Christian spahis.

1522-1523 Of 572 timars, 103 belonged to Christian spahis.

1530 Of 658 timars, only 30 belonged to Christian spahis.²¹

Greek society was thus in part altered or affected by this process of Islamization. But the proportion of Christian to Muslim was also affected by the settlement of sizable numbers of Turks, particularly of nomads. Here the

II

Ottoman documents dedicated to the regulation of the nomads are particularly important. In a defter of 1543 we are informed as to the Selaniki Yuruks, who were densely settled in Macedonia and Thessaly, but much less so in Bulgaria and the Dobrudja. This group consisted of 500 odjaks (c. 27 individuals per odjak, multiplied by 4.5 to get demographic figures) or approximately 59,750 individuals. The Vize Yuruks consisted of 105 odjaks in 1543 or about 12,757 individuals. Much smaller were the 12 odjaks of Tatars around Trikala, consisting of approximately 1,458 bodies.²²

The Ottoman tax registers and laws are absolutely vital for the reconstruction of the economic framework within which Greek society functioned and developed. The kanunname of Larissa for 1569-1570 is instructive for all the Greek lands. It enables us to ascertain the economic relations between the peasants and the Turkish feudal spahis, for aside from the taxes which the peasants paid to the sultan, they paid substantial taxes to the spahis. The first category of obligations were the feudal rents in kind which they paid the spahis. Of these the most important in the kanunname of Larissa is the agricultural tithe, 12.5 percent for Muslims and 13.5 percent for Christians. There follow the tithe on beehives, the tithe which Christians paid on vintage in contrast to the Muslims who paid four akches/donum, and the tax on cotton which for Christians was 2 teker in 15, for the Muslims 1 in 10. Of the feudal rents in cash the most important again was the agricultural tax, which for the Christians was the so-called ispendje of 25 akches and for the Muslim the resm-i chift of 22 akches. There were other cash rents on such things as gardens, sheep, swine, engagement, and matrimony. This does not exhaust the feudal rents but rather gives us some idea of the content of this category of Ottoman document.²³

These feudal rents constituted that part of the empire's wealth which the sultans shared with their warriors. But the sultans reserved for themselves other revenues the most important of which was, perhaps, the capitation on non-Muslims, the kharadj or djizye. Detailed defters recording the amount of the djizye among the Christians have survived, and are of great importance. One such defter for the year 1488-1489 informs us that the assessment on 628,715 hearths was 30,718,889 akches (48.86 akches per unit).²⁴

In the economic realm the Ottoman documentation is overwhelming in its comprehension and detail. The recent study of the expense accounts for the building of the mosque and imaret of Sulayman in Istanbul during the years 1550-1557 reveals the richness of these documents as a source for the economic life of the Greeks at that time. The mufassal muhasebe defterleri list the weekly expenses and workers' salaries incurred during the completion of this complex of buildings. The expenses amounted to 25,702,000 akches. The documents list the craftsmen and laborers who participated in the building, often by name, religion, place of origin, craft specialization,

and daily salary. According to legal status these workers break down into three groups. There were the free *ustas* or master craftsmen, the *adjemoglans* (military slaves of the sultan), and the ordinary slaves. Of the total of 1,468,645 working days put in by the total labor force, 54.84 percent were put in by the free craftsmen, 39.93 percent by the *adjemoglans*, and 5.23 percent by the ordinary slaves. As to the religious affiliation of the free *ustas* the figures are not complete, but they are sufficiently numerous to allow us to estimate the proportion of Christians to Muslims. Of the eight craft groups listed and of the 3,523 *ustas*, 1,810 (51 percent) are Christian, and 1,713 (49 percent) are Muslim. The Christians formed 83 percent of the *benna* or builders, 63.4 percent of the *haddad*, 92 percent of the *lagim* or ditch diggers, whereas Muslims constituted 89 percent of the stone masons, 77.4 percent of the carpenters, and 90 percent of glassworkers. Thus the bulk of the raw labor was furnished by Christians, the bulk of the more skilled labor by Muslims. The salaries of *ustas* or masters, whether Muslim or Christian, tended to range between 10 and 12 *akches* daily, that of apprentices between 1 and 6 *akches*.²⁵

Finally, Ottoman legal literature, particularly the decisions of the *cadis* in the *sharia* courts and the *fatvas* or theoretical legal opinions of the *muftis*, are rich sources for the reconstruction of the legal status and everyday life of the Greeks. The opinions of Ebu Su'ud, the sixteenth-century *mufti* of Istanbul, are illuminating. He pronounced himself of the following legal opinion on the status of Christians in the *sharia* courts.

The testimony of an infidel against a Muslim is not acceptable unless it occurs in one of the following cases: in matters of wills, degree of relationship, or if an heir reclaims from an opponent a right accruing to him from a deceased.²⁶

Admittedly this survey of Islamic historical sources is superficial. It has included texts of varying specificity and interest which convey some idea of the vastness and richness which Islamic sources contain for the complex history of the Greeks.

NOTES

1. A. Vasiliev, *Byzance et les Arabes* (Brussels, 1935-1950).
2. M. Canard, *Histoire de la dynastie des Hamdanides de Jazira et de Syrie* (Paris, 1953); *Recueil des textes relatifs à l'emir Sayf al-Daula la Hamdanide* (Algiers, 1934); *Byzance et les emirs de Proche Orient* (London, 1973); *Miscellanea Orientalia* (London, 1973).
3. A. Miguel, *Géographie humaine du monde musulman jusqu'au milieu du 11^e siècle* (Paris, 1975).
4. For the background of these relations, see Speros Vryonis, "Byzantium and Islam, Seventh-Seventeenth Centuries," *East European Quarterly*, II (1968), 205-240.
5. Al-Baladhuri, *Kitab Futuh al-Buldan*, tr. P. Hitti (New York, 1916), pp. 186-188.

6. Ibid., pp. 207-210.
7. Ibid., p. 301.
8. Ibn Khaldun, *The Muqaddimah*, tr. F. Rosenthal (New York, 1958), II, 8.
9. Al-Nadim, *The Fihrist of al-Nadim: A Tenth-Century Survey of Muslim Culture*, tr. B. Dodge (New York, 1970), II, 581.
10. Ibid., II, 583.
11. Ibid., II, 584.
12. Ibid., II, 693.
13. Miguel, pp. 391-411.
14. Ibid., pp. 411-427.
15. F. Sümer and A. Sevim, *Malazgirt Savası (metinler ve çevirileri)* (Ankara, 1971), give the Arabic text on pp. 7-10. The translation is my own.
16. Speros Vryonis, *The Decline of Medieval Hellenism in Asia Minor and the Process of Islamization from the Eleventh through the Fifteenth Century* (Berkeley, 1971), pp. 381-393.
17. Barkan, "Essai sur les données statistiques des registres de recensement dans l'empire ottoman aux XV^e et XVI^e siècles," *Journal of the Economic and Social History of the Orient*, I (1958), 9-36. Speros Vryonis, "Religious Change and Continuity in the Balkans and Anatolia from the Fourteenth to the Sixteenth Century," in *Islam and Cultural Change in the Middle Ages*, ed. Vryonis (Wiesbaden, 1975), pp. 129-133.
18. H. Lowry, *The Ottoman Tahrir Defters as a Source for Urban Demographic History: The Case of Trabzon (ca. 1486-1583)* (Los Angeles, 1977), p. 307.
19. I. Miroglu, *XVI. yüzyılda Bayburt Sancagi* (Istanbul, 1975), pp. 114-119.
20. H. Inalcik, "Stefan Dusan'dan osmanli imperatorluguna. XV asirda Rumeli'de hiristiyan sipahiler ve menseleri," in *Fatih devri üzerinde tetkikler ve vesikalar* (Ankara, 1954), I, 145-167.
21. Miroglu, pp. 145-147.
22. Gökbilgin, *Rumeli'de Yürükler, Tatarlar ve Evlad-i Fatihan* (Istanbul, 1957), pp. 74-76.
23. J. Kbrda, "O tourkikos kodikas (kanunname) tes Lamias," *Hellenika*, XVII (1962), 202-218.
24. Barkan, "894 (1488/1489) yıl cizyesinin tahsilatına ait muhasebe bilançolari," *Türk Tarih Belgeler Dergisi*, I (1964), passim.
25. Barkan, *Suleymaniye Cami ve imareti inşaatı (1550-1555)* (Ankara, 1972), I, 93-95, 139-142, 250-320.
26. M. Grignaschi, "La valeur du témoignage des sujets non-musulmans (dhimmi) dans l'empire ottoman," *La Preuve, Revue de la Société Jean Bodin*, XVIII (1963), 242-243, 223, 231-233, 236.